



## **SRS Citizen's Advisory Board**

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

### **Nuclear Materials Committee**

#### **Meeting Summary**

North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC  
December 19, 2002

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Nuclear Materials Committee (NMC) met on Thursday, December 19, 2002, at the North Augusta Community Center, North Augusta, SC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the following topic: the revised program objectives for Nuclear Materials Management at SRS and to hear public comment. Attendance was as follows:

#### **CAB Members**

Ken Goad\*  
Murray Riley\*  
Wade Waters\*  
Jerry Devitt  
Perry Holcomb

#### **Stakeholders**

Paula Austin  
Lee Poe  
Bill McDonell

#### **DNFSB**

R. T. Davis

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Sachiko McAlhany, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Rebecca Craft, DOE  
Bill Johnson, WSRC  
Howard Walls, WSRC  
John Dickenson, WSRC  
Teresa Haas, WSRC  
Lyddie Broussard, WSRC

\* NMC Members present

\*\* Note: Beckie Gaston-Dawson, Jimmy Mackey, William Lawrence, Bill Willoughby, and Dorene Richardson are CAB members of the NMC, but were unable to attend this session.

#### **Welcome and Introduction**

Ken Goad, NMC Chair, welcomed the group, requested that each attendee introduce themselves and their affiliation, and encouraged participation from all. He stated that this meeting of the NMC is a follow-up meeting from last week's discussion about a recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) letter on potential changes in canyon utilization plans. He complimented DOE and WSRC for their willingness to meet with the committee so quickly in response to the issues raised during that meeting.

#### **Nuclear Materials Management at the Savannah River Site**

John Dickenson opened the meeting with an overview of nuclear material management at SRS and accelerated cleanup. He referenced the Performance Management Plan (PMP) presentations that had been made to the CAB earlier in the year. He reminded the committee of the October 30, 2002 letter from DOE to WSRC that was given to them at the meeting. That letter provided direction to WSRC to conduct analysis of nuclear material disposition plans for DOE's

consideration as they consider alternatives for accelerating clean-up throughout the DOE Complex. He stated that WSRC had provided their analysis results to DOE SR this week, but no decisions on implementation had been made.

Sachiko McAlhany explained to the committee that the focus of this complex-wide review is on what can be done to reduce risk. DOE SR will evaluate the WSRC letter and will submit a response to EM-1 by the end of the year. She said DOE Headquarters (HQ) will be looking at responses from each site and will then decide on what each site should do. Her purpose at this meeting is to get input from the stakeholders so that she may incorporate their thoughts, concerns, and recommendations as part of the DOE SR response to EM-1 office.

Mr. Dickenson and Ms. McAlhany entertained numerous questions. Specific information on what nuclear materials are under consideration was requested. Mr. Dickenson described the nuclear materials that were analyzed and the potential disposal alternatives, which have been summarized in [Attachment 1](#) (PDF). Public comments have been summarized in [Attachment 2](#) (PDF).

Public Comment

With no other public comments, the meeting was adjourned.

There were no meeting handouts for this meeting. For additional information, call 1-800-249-8155.

## **FOLLOW UP ACTIONS**

1. Question: What will happen with the information once you send it to HQ? Will there be a chance for public comment? (Action assigned to S. McAlhany)

Response: The information will be provided to HQ for evaluation by the Office of Environmental Management (EM). A team, formed by EM-1, will review the information from the sites. The sites will submit proposed changes to the PMP by March 2003 to EM-1 consistent with the proposals. We propose to provide a briefing to the committee of our response in the near future.

2. The following questions were submitted by Jimmy Mackey and the response will be tracked to completion: (Action assigned to J. Dickenson)

A. 2. A DNFSB report from April 1997 established that both canyon vessels were corroding at a rate of 10 mills per year. At that time, the service life prediction with that rate of corrosion was 10 years. What was done? What is the current rate of corrosion? What is the current service life prediction of H Canyon?

B. It was reported that 143 coils had failed in the canyons as of 1997. How many have failed since 1997 per canyon? What is the impact of that failure?

3. In response to a public request, the WSRC submittal to DOE on disposal alternatives (Letter, R. A. Pedde to J. M. Allison, 12/16/02, Nuclear Materials Management at the Savannah River Site) is included as [Attachment 3](#) (PDF).